(3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR(C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO. 1405 2005

PETITIONER : 1) Smt. Madhulika Choubey W/o Rakesh Choubey Aged about –37 years, R/o 10/226, Shakti Bazar, Fohara Chowk, Raipur(C.G.)

2) Smt. Dr. Shikha Mitra W/o Sri Vishwajit Mitra, Aged about 35 years,R/o F-8, Dhebar Pink City New Gayatri Nagar, Raipur(C.G.)

3) Smt. Neha Diwan W/o Cri Ullas Diwan ageed about- 29 years, R/o D-11, Rishabh Nagar, Near, Amlidih, Raipur(C.G.)

4) Ku. Monika Awadhiya D/o Shri Hamuna Awadhiya, Aged about 32 years, R/o 39, State Bank Colony, Sunder Nagar, Raipur. (C.G.)

5) Smt. Smrity Agrawal W/o Sri Pratik Agrawal, Aged about 29 years, R/o 13, College Road, Choubey Colony, Raipur(C.G.)

P.N. No. 1136/05
Presented by Shri O.P. Yadav
dated 15-03-05

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS 1) The State of C.G. Through Secretary Higher Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur(C.G.)

2) The Vice Chancellor Through the Registrar, Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla, University, Raipur(C.G.)

3) The Principal, Pramila Gokul Das Daga Girls College, Katchahari Chowk, Raipur(C.G.)

4) The President, Rashtriya Vidyalaya Committee, Katchahari chowk, Bal Ashram Campus, Raipur (C.G.)

5) The University Grant Commission New Delhi(India)

RECEIVED-COPY
CLERK to A. G. BIL
9/26/05
15/9/05

(4)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(82)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. No. 1405 of 2005

Petitioners	Smt. Madhulika Choubey and others
Versus	
Respondents	State of Chhattisgarh and others

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri, J**

Shri S. C. Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the respondent No.1.

Shri C. R. Sahu, Advocate for the respondent No.2.

Shri A. Goverdhan, Advocate for the respondents No. 3 and 4.

O R D E R

(Passed on this 7th day of February, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that in view of the agreement dated 21.12.2006, entered into between the teachers and the management of Rastriya Vidyalaya Samiti, Raipur, the petitioners seek to withdraw this petition.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the other side has no objection.
3. The petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur